REMARKS

Claims 1-28 and 189-190 are now pending in the application. Claims 29-90, 105-188, and 193-196 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. While Applicant disagrees with the current rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to expedite prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in one or more continuing applications. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-28, 37-39, 51-53, 112-114, 125-127, 139-141, 153-155 and 189-196 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,038,268) in view of "Atmel Announces 802.11b Media Access Controller (MAC) with Integrated Baseband for Wireless Applications" (hereinafter "Atmel"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Krause, either alone or in combination with Atmel, fails to disclose that each of a plurality of sprinkler controllers associated with one of a plurality of sprinklers includes media access controller adapted to obtain the digital data from the signal, frame the digital data, and filter the digital data to select frames of the digital data that are addressed to the one of the plurality of sprinkler controllers.

For example, as shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 26 of the present application, a sprinkler controller 2600 associated with a particular sprinkler or group of

sprinklers receives a signal (representing digital data) and controls the sprinklers accordingly. The sprinkler controller includes a media access controller (MAC) 2622 that receives the digital data. The MAC 2622 frames the digital data and filters the frames to select the frames that are addressed specifically to the sprinkler controller 2600 associated with the MAC 2622. (See Paragraph [0118] of the present application).

Initially, Applicant again notes that Krause appears to be absent of any teaching or suggestion of a media access controller. Instead, Krause describes several examples that are not media access controllers. Here again, Applicant respectfully submits that a generic "digital controller" is not analogous to a media access controller, contrary to the Examiner's assertions.

In response, the Examiner alleges that the media access controller in the claims is not "given the benefit" of being equivalent to a media access controller as understood by those skilled in the art. Applicant respectfully notes that is improper for the Examiner to interpret this limitation as anything other than how one skilled in the art would fairly interpret the term "media access controller." As defined previously in the response filed on May 12, 2008, a media access controller is not a generic controller, but instead includes specific structure that is inherent to its designation as a media access controller. The Examiner ignores the provided definition without providing any evidence whatsoever, either within Krause or any other prior art reference, that the term "media access controller" has ever been applied to a generic digital controller. On the contrary, Applicant respectfully submits that any definition of "media access controller" will be consistent with that provided in the previous response. For example, see:

1. http://www.erg.abdn.ac.uk/users/gorry/course/lan-pages/mac.html
2. http://www.linktionary.com/m/mac.html
3. http://foldoc.org/?query=media+access++control

Further, Krause, either alone or in combination with Atmel, fails to disclose a master unit, a plurality of sprinkler controllers associated with a respective one of a plurality of sprinklers that each include a media access controller, a receiver, and a processor. As described on Pages 49-50 of the response filed on May 12, 2008, Applicant respectfully notes that there is not merely a single device or controller that controls all of the sprinklers. Instead, one device (e.g. the master unit) transmits the digital data and other remote devices (e.g. the sprinkler controllers) receive the digital data and each control their corresponding associated sprinklers.

The Examiner acknowledges that Krause fails to disclose this limitation, and instead relies on Atmel to disclose that each of the plurality of sprinkler controllers includes a media access controller. Applicant respectfully submits that Atmel fails to make up for the deficiencies of Krause.

For example, Krause discloses that a single remote controller controls all of the sprinklers by unilaterally pushing control data to the sprinklers. The sprinklers themselves do not each have an associated controller that includes a receiver, controller, and processor for processing data. Instead, the sprinklers simply respond to the control signals received from the same controller.

Conversely, Atmel merely discloses a media access controller for wireless LANs that is described as an improvement over existing media access and/or baseband controllers in LANs. For example, the portion of Atmel that the Examiner relies on

specifies that "this is very important when doing designs like compact flash cards, mini-PCI cards and especially WLAN modules," and further identifies applications such as printers, PDA's, and calculator. Atmel is absent of any teaching or suggestion of replacing a single main controller in a sprinkler system with a plurality of controllers in respective sprinklers, each including a media access controller, a receiver, and a processor.

Further, Applicant respectfully notes that the stated improvements of "lower cost, lower power consumption, and...a very small footprint" would not be applicable as a replacement to the system of Krause. Krause discloses a single wired controller. Applicant fails to understand how replacing a single wired controller with multiple wireless media access controllers, receivers, and processors in each sprinkler would result in lower cost and power consumption and improve the footprint.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claim 15, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29-36, 40-50, 54-77, 79-85, 87-90, 105-111, 115-124, 128-138, 142-152, 156-159, 161-167, 169, 171-177, 179-182, 184 and 186-188 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krause et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,038,268). Claims 105, 118, 131, 145, 159, 167, 175, 182, 106, 119, 132, 146, 160, 168, 178, 185, 108, 121, 134, 148, 162, 170, 176, 183, 138 and 152 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

as being anticipated by Games et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,215,408). These claims are cancelled.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 16, 2008

By: _____
Hemant Keskar
Reg. No. 61,776

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/rao